

Animadversions

On that part of

Mr. *ROBERT FERGUSON'S*

B O O K,

Entituled,

The *INTEREST* of

REASON

I N

RELIGION,

Which Treats of **JUSTIFICATION;**

In a **LETTER** to a Friend.

LONDON,

Printed by *T. R.* for *Walter Kettilby*, at the
Bishop's head in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1676.

THE ROBERTSON

OF THE

THE

THE

THE

Which is the

and

and

Printed by

S I R,



Return you with Mr. *Ferguson's* Book my hearty thanks for the Loan of it. I have read it, and find many things well said in it. And where I find anything otherwise, I impute it not to his want of ability if the Cause would bear it; but the Cause it self in those particular Instances which I suspect him to be defective in. For neither he nor any other, of what ability soever he be, can, as Solomon sayes, *make that streight which God hath made crooked*, Eccles. 7. 13. And therefore the greater the parts be of any man, who yet cannot make work of a Cause he undertakes, it doth but make me so much the more doubtfull of the goodness of that Cause, if it were any whit doubtfull to me before.

I will give you one instance of this nature out of Mr. *Ferguson's* book, Chap. 2, Sect 10. Where he asserts that Mr. *Sherlock's* Notion (as he calls it) of Justification, *is not any wayes maintainable but by perverting innumerable texts from their plain and naturall Sense to a Metaphorick: and*

that it is accompanied with this fatall unhappiness of turning a great part of the Bible into mere insignificant and empty Metaphors. P. 402. 403. And then represents Mr. Sherlock's notion thus. That we are only justified by believing and obeying the Gospel of Christ. That the Sacrifice of Christ's death and the Righteousness of his life have no other influence upon our acceptance with God, but that to them we owe the Covenant of Grace: That is, God being well pleased with the obedience of Christ's life and the Sacrifice of his death, entered into a new Covenant with mankind, wherein he promiseth pardon of Sin and eternal life to those who believe and obey the Gospel. So that the Righteousness of Christ is not the formal cause of our Justification, but the Righteousness of his life and death is the Meritorious Cause whereby we are declared Righteous and rewarded as Righteous persons. The Covenant of Grace, which God for Christ's sake hath made, pardoning our past sins and follies, and rewarding a sincere though imperfect Obedience. The Gospel by its great arguments and motives and powerfull assistances, forms our minds to the love and practice of Holiness, and so makes us inherently righteous: and the
Grace

Grace of the Gospel accepts and rewards that sincere Obedience, which according to the Rigor and Severity of the Law could deserve no reward. P. 404.

Mr. Ferguson having made this recital out of Mr. Sherlock's book, knew not how as it seems to make good his charge there-from ; unless Mr. S. would be so kind as to grant what Mr. F. doth affirm, but Mr. S. himself no where asserts. And therefore although he grants in P. 416. *That in reference to the mere demands of the Gospel we may in a proper sense be said to be justified; Yet he saith that in reference to the Law, which is that alone which accuseth us, we cannot in any propriety of speech be said to be justified, but that justification, wheresoever it regards our discharge from the accusation of the Law, must be taken Metaphorically; (he meanes I suppose) unless we are discharged from that accusation by having the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. Whether this be true or no, I shall put to the Tryal afterwards.*

But in the mean time, pray you consider how little reason Mr. F. had to go about to charge Mr. S. with holding Justification in a *Metaphorick* sense, unless he had first shew-

ed us, that according to M. S's sentiment of Justification before represented, he had made something else necessary to it, than that which is an answering of the demands of the Gospel, which yet he hath not done that I can see. But indeed M. F. is so far from doing that, as that he hath done the quite contrary, as you cannot but perceive, when you compare Mr. F's concession and Mr. S's notion touching Justification together: for Mr. F. acknowledgeth, as I said before, that in reference to the mere demands of the Gospel we may in a proper sense be said to be Justified; and M. S. saith no more, as M. F. recites him, but that we are only Justified by believing and obeying the Gospel. And if to believe and obey the Gospel be not to answer the demands of the Gospel and no more, pray you get Mr. F. to tell us what is. But if it be, then Mr. F. instead of making good his charge against M. S. hath himself even fairly acquitted and discharged him from it, and might well have taken himself off here, and saved himself the labour of further prosecution.

But however, though M. S. doth not, yet it seems Mr. F. doth hold, that we must be Justified, if Justified, at all, by answering the demands

demands of the Law as well, as of the Gospel, although the Scripture tells us that *he that abideth in the Doctrine of Christ (which is the Gospel) he hath both the Father and the Son. Rep. Jo. 9.* And because Mr. F. is of opinion that the demands of the Law must be answered or else we cannot be Justified, therefore he thinks Mr. S. ought to be so too, which if he can perswade him to be, then he doubts not, but that he shall be able to make good his charge against him.

And therefore to lay a foundation for a necessity of a perfect legal Righteousness unto Justification, though not inherent in our selves, yet by derivation of it from our Saviour, in whom it was, he does in effect assert the Original Legal Covenant to remain still in force, notwithstanding the establishing with men the Evangelical : and that in order to our Justification, it is not enough to have an Evangelical Righteousness to answer the demands of the Gospel, but that we must also have a perfect legal Righteousness to answer the demands of the Law, though not in our selves but, by derivation from another, as was said before.

Whether this be not so, judge, I pray you, by his own words, comparing what he sayes in P. 411, and P. 414. which are these. *Now as the introduction of the law of faith hath not abrogated the law of perfect obedience, but this as well as that doth remain in force, each of them requiring a conformity to its own demands: So supposing us to answer all that the Gospel requires, yet the other law abiding uncanceled, and we being all guilty of the violation of its terms, there lies accordingly a charge against us, from which by Justification we are to be acquitted. p. 414. And again p. 411. That secluding not only the righteousness of Christ's life, but the satisfaction of his death as the Matter, and the imputation of it as the formal Cause of justification, it seems repugnant to the immutability and essentiall Holiness of God, to justify us upon an imperfect obedience, the Law which requireth a perfect remaining still in force, and denouncing wrath in case of every failure.*

By all which you will perceive, I suppose, that Mr. F. holds that the Law remains still in force, requiring a perfect obedience unto justification, and for want thereof and in case of every failure, denounceth

nounceth wrath. And that therefore unless the satisfaction of Christ's death and the righteousness of his life were formally imputed to us, (*ie.* (as I suppose he means) so as that we may be said to have made satisfaction in and by him, and perfectly kept the Law in and by him by having his obedience and satisfaction imputed to us) it would be repugnant to the immutability and essentiall Holiness of God to justify upon an imperfect Obedience.

In which assertions of his there seem to me to be two grand mistakes, besides that of a formal imputation he speaks of . The first is in holding the law to be still in force, not only in requiring obedience to it self by way of *Duty*, which is true, but in requiring *perfection* of Obedience as a *Condition* of Justification, and in its *Rigor* and severity in denouncing wrath in case of *every failure*. Secondly, In that he holds, that though we should answer all that the Gospel requires both in respect of a righteousness of inherent Grace, and of a personal sincere obedience, yet we could not be justified without the formal imputation of a perfect legal righteousness, as aforesaid, and that these two are grand mistakes indeed, I shall endeavor to demonstrate to you. In

In opposition to the first of them, I conceive the Scripture will warrant me to affirm, That God by founding a *new* Covenant, a Covenant of *Grace*, with the world in his Son Jesus Christ and his Mediatory undertaking, hath *Rescinded* or Superse- ded the Rigour and severity of the original Law in two things. First as a legal perfection of obedience was by it required as the *Condition* of Justification and life: And Secondly, as it did *denounce* wrath and Condemnation in case of *every failure*.

Although the original Law of nature, the moral Law be eternal and unchangeable in requiring obedience by way of *Duty*, yet it is not so in the foresaid Rigour and severity of its Sanction.

To establish the Law again in this sense after the Covenant of Promise is made, would be according to the Apostle's reasoning to *make faith void, and the Promise of none effect. Rom. 4. 14. Gal. 3. 18.* For the old and new terms of Justification cannot consist together, without the one evacuating the other. *If by Grace* (saith the Apostle) *then is it no more of works: otherwise Grace would be no more Grace. But if of works, then it is no more Grace; other-*
wise

wise work is no more work. Ro. 11. 6. And again, *whosoever of you are justified by the law ye are fallen from Grace,* Gal. 5. 4. By the interposition of Christ we are *redeemed* from the Sanction or *Curse of the Law*, which curseth every one that continueth not in all things which it requireth, and that for this very end, *that the blessing of Abraham* (viz. of being Justified by faith according to the terms of the new Covenant) *might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ,* Gal. 3. 13, 14. Intimating, that this blessing of the new Covenant could not have taken place, if the Curse of the old had still remained.

When St. Paul saith, that *the Ministration of Death written & engraven in stones is done away* (2 Cor. 3, 7. Compared with v. 11.) I pray you what of this was done away by the Introduction of the Evangelical ministration, if not the *Rigour* of the *Condition* of escaping the Curse of it? For from that it is that it is denominated the Ministration of Death and Condemnation, and it is done away as such a Ministration. For otherwise the Law engraven in stones, as it is a Rule of and obligation to Duty, is not done away: In this sense indeed Christ *did not come to destroy the Law,* Mat. 5. 17. This

This benefit by Christ in God's making a new Covenant and granting new terms, upon account of his undertaking, is not limited to some men only, but extended to all. In this sense Christ died for all men without exception. And it is not unlikely, but that one reason at least, why God in his wisdom and goodness thought it meet to vouchsafe unto the whole race of Adam these new and gracious terms of recovery after the fall, when no such thing is granted the lapsed Angels, was this, because the Condemnation, into which the Angels fell, was by their own personal actuall rebellion without Temptation from another; whereas the Condemnation, into which all the posterity of *Adam* fell, proceeded originally from his and his wives transgression, (and that from the temptation of the Devil) and not from the personal act of their Progeny.

And that the benefit of freeing men from the Rigorous Sanction of the Law by the active and passive obedience of Christ, in which the new Covenant is founded, is as extensive, as ever the effect of Adam's disobedience was in subjecting all men to condemnation according to the Rigorous terms of the Law, is I conceive plainly asserted by

by the Apostle, when he saith in Rom. 5. 18: *as by the Offence of One Judgement came upon all men to Condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto Justification of life.* By the *free gift*, which comes by the Righteousness of Christ upon all men unto Justification of life, I understand the *New Covenant*. For this free gift can neither be the righteousness of the One here spoken of, but that which is procured by it, Nor yet justification itself, for that is the effect of it. So that we cannot in reason understand it otherwise than of some middle thing, and that in all probability can be none other than the *Grace* contained in the *New Covenant*, which Covenant God by a most gracious graunt and free gift hath vouchsafed to all men for the Righteousness sake of Christ here spoken of, in which remission of Sin and eternal life are promised upon condition of faith. And this exactly agrees with what the same Apostle saith *Eph. 2. 8.* when he saith that *by Grace we are saved through faith, and that not of our selves, it is the gift of God: that is, it is the Grace and gift of God, that now we may be saved by faith; a favour which the Law ne-*
ver

ver afforded ; for the *Law is not of faith, but the man that doth them shall live in them.* And when the Apostle saith this free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, we are not to understand it, I conceive, as if Justification in *act* came upon all men universally by the righteousness of Christ and this free gift, but that for the sake of the one and in the other, such gracious *terms* are granted and offered to *all men* without exception, as by which they *may attain* unto justification of life *actually*, if they do not wilfully *neglect and reject* them. And less than this I see not how the Apostle's words can signifie, if you consider the nature of the Comparison he makes between the effects of the first Adam's disobedience and the second Adam's obedience in reference unto all men without exception of any. As by the disobedience of the former all men were brought under an utter incapacity of being justified and saved so long as the original Covenant in the Rigour of its Sanction remained in force, So by the obedience of the latter all men are put into a capacity of being justified and saved by vertue of new terms in the new Covenant, which are obtained thereby, and by

by which the old terms are Cancelled or Superfeded.

These things being so, I leave you to judge whether there be any need of or any *occasion* for such a formal imputation of Christ's righteousness unto our justification to answer the Law in its demands of perfect legal obedience as a condition of it, and the accusations thereof for want of it, as Mr. F. contends for and Mr. S. opposeth For this demand and this accusation was taken off so soon as the new Covenant founded by God in Christ's active and passive obedience took place. And this benefit of having *new terms* of life granted, which accrues to the world by Christ's Mediatory undertaking, does not at all depend upon our believing in Christ, but is *absolutely free*, and that wherein he hath been aforehand with us and with all men which have been born into the world since the Covenant of Grace did first commence, and remains made good to them whether they beleive it or no. So that from thence forth no man shall be condemned for want of a perfect legal Righteousness, but only for want of an Evangelical righteousness.

And because this is a matter of weight,

I will add yet something further to prove, that this new Covenant, by which the terms of the old are cancel'd, is made and established in Christ, not only with some part of mankind, *viz.* Such as shall be saved, as some would restrain it (who think it in the nature of it absolute and not conditional, no not in reference to particular persons, which yet it must needs be, if made to all, unless all were eventually to be saved) but it's made with all men universally. And to this purpose I pray you consider the declaration of God's grace and favour to all mankind in those words of his to Abraham Isaac and Jacob, mentioned no less than five times in the book of Genesis, *viz. In thee and in thy Seed shall all families, all Nations of the earth be blessed.* Chap. 12. 3. and 18. 18. and 22. 18. and 26. 4. and 28. 14. By which the unbelieving Jews indeed understood, that in time all Nations should become profelytes to Judaism, and their Nation become the head of all Nations, and the Messias a glorious visible head over them. But in opposition hereto and to their expectations of Justification by the Law, St. Paul interprets it to be meant of the Covenant of Grace established in Christ

Christ with all Nations and Families of the Earth, who are all so far blessed hereby, as to have new-terms of Salvation granted them, *Gal. 3.* For, whereas they understood by seed the whole posterity of *Abraham* in *Jacob's* line, as if all Nations should be blessed in them; *St. Paul* restrains it only to Christ, as all Nations were to be blest in him, as head of the Covenant *vers. 16.* *He saith not unto Seeds as of many, but as of one, and to thy Seed which is Christ.* And then that the blessing promised to all Nations in this Seed was the Covenant, appears by the next words in *vers. 17.* *And this I say, that the Covenant, which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was 430 years after cannot disanull, that it should make the promise of none effect.* This Covenant we see was then confirmed of God in Christ, not then first made, for it was extant in the world before. And to the same sense *St. Paul* had said before in *vers. 8.* *The Scriptures, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all Nations be blessed.* And when he saith, that God in those words preached the Gospel unto *Abraham*, it is all one as to have said he

declared to him the *Covenant*, for Gospel here and Covenant in *vers.* 17. are two words indeed, but signifie the same thing, as frequently they do elsewhere. And St. *Peter* expressly calls that promise to *Abraham* the *Covenant*. *Acts* 3. 25. And besides St. *Paul* declares what the nature and substance of that Covenant or Gospel was, which is extended to all Nations in that promise, and that, he sayes, was, that God would *justify the heathen through Faith*; which is a breif description of the Covenant of Grace. These things then being so, that God hath established a new Covenant with all men, and thereby cancelled the Rigorous Sanction of the Primitive Law, as that required *perfection* of Obedience as the *Condition* of Justification, I now leave you to judge whether Mr. *F.* doth not build the necessity of the imputation of Christ's Righteousness unto Justification in the sense he asserts it necessary, upon an imaginary foundation and groundless Supposition, and if he do, that foundation being removed, that which he builds thereon must needs fall.

Having I hope, Sir, by this time satisfied you, and clearly evinced, that I have not without cause charged Mr. *F.* with the former

mer of the two grand mistakes above mentioned, I shall now proceed to endeavour to do the like touching the Second, which Second, as you may remember, was in that he holds that although we should *answer all that the Gospel requires*, both in respect of a righteousness of *inherent Grace*, and of personal *sincere obedience*, yet we could not be justified without such a *perfect righteousness* imputed to us, and derived upon us, as would adequately *answer the demands and accusations of the Law*. That thus he holds is evident by what he says in p., 414. and in other passages in the same Section.

I shall not need here to do again what I have done already, that is ; to prove the non-necessity of the imputation of such a righteousness unto us for our Justification, as every way answers the demands of the **Law**, as considered in its originall Rigour and severity. That which remains for me to do, is to demonstrate to you, that M. *Ferguson* is under a mistake in denying that our answering all that the Gospel requires in a righteousness both of inherent Grace and personal sincere obedience, is a vailable to justification, without the imputation of

Christ's righteousness in Mr. F's sense, and withall to shew that we are said in a proper sense to be justified by believing and obeying the Gospel ; and that Mr. F. had neither ground nor fair pretence to charge Mr. S's sentiment of being justified by believing and obeying the Gospel, with any such absurdity or inconvenience, as that it is not maintainable without perverting innumerable texts from their plain and natural sense to a Metaphorick.

Only let me premise this, that it would alwayes be remembred, that whatever benefits do accrue to us by vertne of the new Covenant, are owing unto Christ and truly attributable unto him, in whom, for whose sake, and upon account of whose undertaking the Covenant it self, and all the benefits of it are vouchsafed unto men. And accordingly this Covenant in Scripture is said to be *confirmed of God in Christ*, Gal. 3. 17. to be the *new-Testament in his blood*, Mat. 26. 28. and his blood to be *the blood of the everlasting Covenant*, Heb. 13. 20. And he himself *given for a Covenant of the People*, 1s. 42. 6. and *all the promises of God are in him yea, and in him amen*. 2. Cor. 1. 22. What ever then depends
upou

upon this Covenant, depends upon Christ, and accordingly the benefits promised in it, Remission of sin, and eternal life are in Scripture ascribed unto him. And although Faith, as comprehending repentance and sincere obedience, be imputed for righteousness, yet it is not for its own sake that it is so, but for Christ's sake, and all by vertue of the divine will which hath of mere Grace and favour appointed that so it shall be.

This being premised, I proceed now to shew, that we are justified by God upon our believing and obeying the Gospel, and that in a proper sense, and that our believing and obeying the Gospel is our Evangelical righteousness; upon the taking place whereof in men, God accounts, and by the doctrine in the Scriptures declares them just, and deals with them accordingly, which is his justifying of them.

To this end let it be considered, that this Covenant, as founded by God in the righteousness of Christ's life, and Sacrifice of his death, doth consist of two parts, of *Conditions* required by God, and to be performed by men; and of *promise* of benefits made by God and to be performed

by him, but to be received and enjoyed by men. The *Condition*, upon which promise of benefits is made by God, is that which Mr. S. rightly calls a *believing and obeying* the Gospel. And the *benefits* promised upon the aforesaid condition, Mr. S. truly saith are *pardon of Sin and eternal life*. That such promises are made and upon such conditions, appears every where in Scripture, where things of this nature are spoken of, as every one knows, that knows the Scripture: and Mr. F. himself stands declared no enemy to the Doctrine of the conditionality of the promises.

Things then being thus settled between God and all men in this Covenant, the enquiry upon every man's tryall will be, whether he hath performed the condition required on his part in believing, repenting, and sincerely obeying. If it be found that he hath, he is thereupon as truly and in a proper Sense justified, that is accounted and by the Gospel declared and pronounced Evangelically just and righteous, *i. e.* in the sense of this Evangelicall Law, as he would have been in the sense of the Original Law, in case he had observed the terms of that.

And

And had I been to have written to Mr F. I would have enquired of him, which of these things now mentioned he would or could deny, being all so perfectly agreeable, as they are, to the tenour and very letter of the Scripture? Will he, or can he deny belief in the Gospel, and obedience to it to be the Condition, upon which God in the Gospel or new Covenant hath promised pardon of Sin and eternal life? or, which is the same, that he hath promised these benefits to such and to no other?

This I take for granted he will not deny.

Next I would demand whether Faith, Repentance and sincere obedience, be not all that is required of men themselves by God in the Gospel to make them Evangelically righteous, and capable of the saving benefits promised in the Gospel? If they be (and I believe Mr. F. will not deny them to be so, from one of his own assertions p. 414.) then I further query, whether these do not denominate a man Evangelically righteous, or righteous in the gospel sense, as well as the doing all that the Law required would have denominated a man legally righteous, or righteous in the sense of the Law?

And further whether men from those qualifications afore said, are not in Scripture so denominated? As for instance, *Faith*, which is, as I have said, comprehensive of repentance and sincere obedience when saving, this, as the Scripture tells us expressly, *was counted to Abraham for righteousness*, Rom. 4. 3. Gal. 3. 6. And we are told also; that the Scripture, speaking of this in reference to *Abraham*, *was not written for his sake only, but for us also to whom it shall be imputed if we believe on him, who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.* vers. 23. 24.

And then for Evangelical or sincere obedience, that comes in also for a share in denominating a man righteous, in a gospel sense: *He that doth righteousness is righteous*, saith *St. John*, 1 Ep. 3. 7. and he speaks it of that righteousness which men themselves do in a course of sincere obedience, and not of the righteousness of another imputed to them. *In the righteousness which he hath done shall he live* saith the *Phophet*, speaking of a man that shall turn from all the sins which he hath committed, and shall *observe all God's Statutes, and do all that which is lawfull and right*, Ezek. 18. 22. If
then

then Faith, Repentance and sincere obedience, be all that the gospel requires to denominate a man righteous in a gospel sense, and to make him capable of the promised benefits, Then all those in whom these are found, are by God in the Gospel declared and pronounced righteous men; which Declaration is their Justification: For what is done in this kind by the gospel on Earth, is done also by God in Heaven.

No man sure that understands and considers what he saith, will deny this to be Justification in a proper sense, nor assert it not maintainable without perverting the scriptures from their plain and natural meaning to a *Metaphorick* sense, whereas its most evident, it stands back't with the Scriptures, understood in their plain proper and genuine sense.

But because *Mr. Ferguson* was somewhat sensible, that he could not duly infer any thing from *Mr. S's* own words, touching his apprehensions about Justification, but what was agreeable to the Notion of justification in a proper sense, in reference to the demands of the gospel, as you may perceive by what he saith towards the beginning

ning of the page 416. And because he had a great mind to fasten something by way of retortion upon *Mr. S's* Notion of Justification, as if it had not been maintainable to be Justification properly so called, without wresting the Scriptures from their plain and proper sense, (which was the the thing *Mr. S.* charged on them, whose opinion *Mr. F.* undertakes to defend ;) therefore *Mr. F.* insinuates to his Reader that *Mr. S's* Notion doth imply (unless he will allow that we are Justified by being made righteous by the perfect Righteousness of Christ imputed to us,) such a Justification, as cannot be properly so called nor maintained to be such, without perverting the Scriptures from their plain and proper sense, to that which is but so Metaphorically. And to this end he takes it for granted that Justification in *Mr. S's* Notion of it, contains in it *remission of Sins* ; and then argues that remission of Sin is not Justification in a proper sense, and consequently that *Mr. S's* Notion of justification cannot be made good from the Scriptures, without understanding them in an improper sense.

But if *Mr. F.* would have done this designed

signed business indeed against *Mr. S.* he should have done one of these two things, which yet he hath not done. Either first shewed that *Mr. S.* hath defined justification by pardon of sin, or Secondly, that according to his Notion of it, it must be so defined; neither of which he hath done that I finde. And therefore he doth but beat the air, while he would have his Reader think he is beating *Mr. S.*

That pardon of sin is promised in the Covenant of Grace to those that believe and obey the Gospel, *Mr. S.* doth indeed assert, and that according to the Scriptures: and this pardon, when vouchsafed, doth discharge us from whatever lay against us, either from Law or Gospel, and is called in Scripture a not mentioning our sins unto us, *Ezek. 33. 16.* the remembring them no more, *Heb. 10. 17.* a not imputing of them, *Rom. 4. 8.* *2. Cor. 5. 19.* but then these are two distinct things, to justify a person against an accusation of not believing and obeying the Gospel, and the conferring upon him the benefits promised to those that have. If they be not different, but one and the same thing, then the *giving of eternal life* it self, is an assentiall part
of

of our justification as well as the forgiveness of our sins, for that as well as the forgiveness of sins is promised to those who believe and obey the Gospel. And I think no man yet ever asserted, that the giving of eternal life was justification itself, but a benefit promised to those who are justified, according to St. Paul, *Rom. 8. 30. Whom he justified, them he also glorified* : Justification is God's *imputing righteousness* to men, or their faith to them for righteousness: and thus *Abraham* was justified by having his faith imputed to him for righteousness. But pardon of sin is his *not imputing to them their Trespases* : and I must needs say, I cannot apprehend how the imputation of faith for righteousness, and the non-imputation of sin can be all one.

God in justifying men, avoucheth and pronounceth them to be such as to whome he hath promised pardon, that is true believers, such as have performed the condition of the promise. But then the counting of this performance of the condition for righteousness unto them is one thing, and the conferring on them the benefit promised on that condition is another, as I said.

IF

If God had promised pardon only upon account of what Christ hath done and suffered for Sinners, without any condition to be performed on their part, then they would have had title to pardon without the justification I speak of: But since it is otherwise, a man's title to pardon is not cleared without being *justified* in order thereto, *as a performer of the condition.*

Moreover the *clearing the equity* of God's proceeding in pardoning some, and not other some, depends upon this, *viz.* That he can justify one sort to be such as have repented, and performed the condition on which he promised pardon; whereas he cannot do so concerning the other. *Ezek. 18.* And when I consider this, I cannot see, but that we have as much reason to think it meet and necessary, that there should be such a difference between justification and pardon as hath been intimated, as there is to believe, that its fit and necessary, that the reason and equity of god's proceedings should be cleared before *Angels* and men, in pardoning some and not others. And if this be found agreeable to reason, then you have an evidence from the reason

reason and nature of the thing why it should be so, as well as from the Scriptures to shew that it is so.

Yet its very true also, that there is so very close and inseparable a connexion between Justification and Remission of Sin, as that the Scripture (which does not alwayes nicely difference things which yet are distinguishable, but sometimes terms things by the same name, which differ only but in some respect, and sometimes denotes things of the same nature, by different phrases and forms of speech,) I say the connexion between Justification and Remission is so close and inseparable, as that the Scripture sometimes speakes of them promiscuously, scarcely leaving any difference to be discerned between them; which I conceive hath led so many to place Justification in Remission of Sin, as are of that Judgement.

Such is *Rom.* 4. 6, 7. for one, where *the blessedness of the man, to whom God imputeth Righteousness without works, is thus described by David, as St. Paul saith, reciting his words, saying, : Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.* Where you will hardly perceive

ceive any difference made between the imputation of Righteousnes, and forgiveness of Sins, unless we distinguish between righteousness imputed, and the blessedness of having sin pardoned as consequent upon it; which I think may very well be done. For the Apostle doth not say, that *David* describes the *Justification* of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, when he saith, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven; but the *blessedness* of such a person who is so justified, or to whom righteousness is imputed. Which blessedness he placeth in the forgiveness of sins, and being restored to the Divine favour. So that these words of *David*, as I said, are not a *description* of Justification, but of the *blessedness* a man comes to be possessed of by being justified. The reason and design of the Apostle in reciting these words of *David*, I shall shew afterwards.

Again, *Acts* 13.39. is another such Scripture, where it's said, that *by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses*. Where to be justified, and to be delivered from the desert of sin, seem to be
the

the same: Unless you will distinguish (as well you may) between that *from* which we are delivered, to wit, the obligation to Punishment, and that *by* means whereof we come so to be delivered, to wit, our being justified: and then to be justified from those things, signifies no more here, than by justification to come to be pardoned and so delivered from condemnation.

But if you will understand Justification in a large sense, as comprehending and taking in with it its effects, (in which sense faith it self is oft to be understood,) then indeed it includes pardon of sin: and then in this sense to be pardoned is to be justified, and to be justified is to be pardoned. In which sense or respect it may be it is, that many renowned both Persons and Churches, have made little or no difference between Justification and remission of sin.

And now, *Sir*, if what I have suggested have any weight in it, (which I submit to tryal) then you may see, that there is a Justification of believers properly so called, plainly and without figure asserted in Scripture, and yet not consisting in that imputation of Righteousness neither, which Mr. F. so much contends for; nor yet in
Remission

Remission of Sin neither, the necessity of which he would infer in case the other be denied; but in the imputation of that believing and obeying the Gospel for Righteousness, to which Mr. S. saith, pardon is promised: And if so, then Mr. F. hath only shewed us what he had a mind to do, but not at all performed what he undertook.

But when Mr. F. asserts, That unless we are justified by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in his sense of Imputation, we cannot be said to be justified *properly*, but only to be *pardoned*, and that to be pardoned is not to be *justified properly*: he proceeds therein upon a mistaken ground, and confounds the terms and conditions of the original Law and Gospel Covenant together. For he supposeth, that in order to our Justification in a *proper* sense, we must one way or other have such a Righteousness as will answer the demands of the Law in point of perfect obedience, and of the Gospel otherwise, and which will justify us against all accusations to the contrary. And that therefore we having no such Righteousness of our own, we cannot be justified but by having the Righteousness of Christ made ours by Imputation, that we

C

may

may therewith answer the demands and accusations of the Law. Or in case we should not be justified by the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ to answer the demands of the Law, yet that then we must be justified by being pardoned, and Pardon is not Justification properly so called.

But while he argues at this rate, he overlooks what God hath done. to supersede and relax the rigorous terms of the primitive Law, by a new Law of Grace established in Christ with all Mankind, and according to which he will now proceed with us, and not according to the rigorous demands of the primitive Law. By reason of this, to wit, God's relaxing the old and introducing new terms of Justification and Life, it follows, that neither a perfect Legal Righteousness is now necessary to Justification, nor yet that Justification must consist only in pardon of Sin, though we have no such Righteousness inherent or imputed (in Mr. F's. sense of Imputation) as will answer the demands of the Law in point of perfection.

Such a Righteousness is not now *necessary* to Justification. First, because that
which

which once made it necessary to that end, is now relaxed by a new Law : this I have shewed before *.

Secondly, because by this new Law the Righteousness, which consisteth in a penitential regenerating obediential Faith, is made the condition upon which Pardon and Life are promised : And because likewise the performance of this Condition is by God counted to us for Righteousness, like as a fulfilling of the Legal Condition would have been counted our Legal Righteousness, had we never sinned.

** This new Law doth not relax the duty due by the old, but alter the condition on which the divine favour was at first enjoyable, and hath now made sincere obedience to it and to the Gospel, the condition of it instead of sinless perfection : And it grants pardon of all past offences against both, to such as are justified against the accusation of not having performed the Condition, and of all after-offences also, that are consistent with godly sincerity: By reason whereof an answering the old demands of the Law, absolute perfection, is not now necessary to justification, neither as inherent in us, nor as imputed to us, otherwise than as Christ's perfect righteousness is imputed to us in the fruits and benefits of it, which is quite another thing than the imputation of his righteousness it self to us ; differing as much as the acts of his mediation differ from the benefits received thereby.*

Although the Righteousness of Christ's Active and Passive Obedience, is that Righteousness by which the Covenant it

self, and the benefits of it, were conditionally obtained for us, and granted to us : And although it is of God's mercy, and by vertue of Christ's Merits, and the Promise and Ordination of God, that we come to have any title to Pardon and Life, when we have performed the Condition, and not by vertue of any merit or desert in the performance it self ; yet this Righteousness of Christ does not entitle us to Pardon and Life, until we have performed the Condition on our part required thereto, which is such a believing as aforesaid. And in the last issue we are accounted by God Righteous or Unrighteous, according as we have, or have not perform'd the Condition.

God's design towards us is to restore us to happiness, and in order thereto to recover and bring again into our Nature those Vertues in which our likeness to God at first did consist ; by the loss of which we became miserable, and without a recovery of which we cannot be happy. And as most suitable to this design, God hath made such a Faith the Condition of Pardon and Life, as by which the renovation of our Nature is gradually wrought, and without which
we

we have no ground to expect those benefits, how desirable soever they are to us, and notwithstanding all that Christ hath done and suffered to obtain them for us.

To suppose that God accounts us Righteous, and so confers a title to Pardon and Life, only by the Righteousness of Christ imputed, without respect to our being renewed in the Spirit of our minds, and sanctified by Faith, is to suppose him acting disagreeably to his own design and method of Grace in recovering us from our undone condition. To think we are made Righteous only by what our Saviour hath done without us, without being renewed by a work of Faith within us: To suppose we are by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness delivered from the danger of the Hell without us, without being at all freed from the Hell within us, which consists in unnatural Lusts, and the uneasie effects of them: To imagine that God should restore us to a participation of the priviledges of his Children by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, without restoring us at all to a participation in the Divine and New Nature of his Children, is absurd, and that which is opposed by the constant tenour of

Divine Doctrine in the holy Scriptures : And yet these are but the natural consequences of the Doctrine of being justified by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness *alone*, and of being justified by Faith *alone* as abstracted from it's effect of renewing us. And if either of these Doctrines were true, we might have an immediate title to Pardon and Salvation without Repentance, and without being born again ; unless we will suppose that Justification does not immediately entitle us to these ; which to suppose is as absurd as any of the rest : For what, I pray you, would such a Justification signify ?

And then as concerning the other thing, *viz.* That if we have not by the Imputation of Christ's perfect Righteousness, a Righteousness to answer the demands of the Law, that then, as Mr. F. infers, we can have no Justification but what consists in the remission of Sins ; I answer : That for the same reason that we are accounted Righteous upon our performing the Condition of the promise, pardon cannot be our Justification, but a benefit consequent upon it.

For if God's owning or avouching the
Condition

Condition to be performed on our part (as he does when it is performed) on which he hath promised Pardon and Salvation, be his justifying of us, or his accounting us righteous according to the tenour of the Covenant of Grace, as indeed it is; then Pardon is not our Justification it self, but one of the benefits unto which our Justification by vertue of the New Covenant doth entitle us: for the one is promised but on condition of the other. And as the thing promised, and the Condition on which it is promised, are not the same; so neither is the reckoning or accounting us righteous, as having performed the Condition of the Promise of Pardon, and the actual Pardon it self, the same; but so much as these differ, so much does Justification and Pardon differ.

But yet for all that, I do not deny but that in a large sense, as Justification is opposed to Condemnation, it may comprehend remission of Sins. That is, if by Condemnation you understand both conviction of impenitency (which is the opposite to Justification properly) and the obligation or obnoxiousness thereby to suffer the pains of the second Death: And by Justification both a vindication from impenitency and

unbelief (which is Justification properly) and also a discharge thereby from obnoxiousness to eternal punishment, then, as I said, Justification thus opposed to condemnation does indeed include in it remission of Sin; though when strictly and most properly considered, Justification seems to be one thing, and Pardon of Sin another.

It is wont to be alledged, That when St. Paul saith in *Rom. 4. 6.* that *God imputeth Righteousness without Works*; the meaning is, That he imputeth the Righteousness of Christ to us without any Works of ours at all, Legal or Evangelical, External or Internal. And because great stress is laid on it by some, I will briefly shew how the Context directs us to another sense of those words.

The Scope of the Apostle in this and the former Chapter is to prove, that Justification proceeds from God of *Grace* and favour, and not of *Debt*. To make this good, he shews here that it must needs be so, because it is vouchsafed not unto such who have been alwayes righteous (for he had proved before, Chap. 3. that there are none such, but that all, both Jews and Gentiles have sinned) but to such as have
been

been *ungodly*, when once they believe, and therefore cease to be so, and become sincerely righteous. And the Apostle's reason depends upon this manifest truth, That such as have once sinned can never by any after-works, which they can do, merit the Divine favour as a Debt due to them by desert of their Works, nor are capable of that favour upon any other terms, than what God of his mere Grace is pleased to appoint as the Condition of it, as he hath done that of Faith. *For to him that worketh not* (saith he) *but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness*, ver. 5.

And to prove as well as to assert that God justifieth none upon account of their having been alwayes righteous, and in his favour (as some Jews fancied themselves to have been upon account of their observing the Law of *Moses*, as he in the Gospel who said, *All these have I kept from my youth up*) he shew's out of the *Psalms* of *David*, how that the ancient godly Jews did alwayes esteem their happiness of being in God's favour, not to proceed from the *merit* of their Works in observing the Law of *Moses*, but from the Grace and Mercy of
God

God in forgiving their Sins, and accepting their sincere endeavours to please him. *Even as David* (saith he) *describes the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered, ver. 6, 7.*

And you may easily discern, if you observe it, that what is said in this sixth and seventh verses, is to back and make good what he had said in vers. 5. touching God's justifying men upon their believing, notwithstanding they had been in a state of ungodliness before: And to shew that if he justifie such men upon such terms; Justification must needs proceed of Grace, and not of Debt or merit of Works, of which he had spoken vers. 4. saying, *Now to him that worketh the reward is not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt.* So that in making a Judgment of what Works St. Paul speaks, when he saith, *Righteousness is imputed without Works, vers. 6.* if you do but take your rise from what's said in vers. 4. touching such Works, the reward of which is reckoned not of Grace, but of Debt, and so follow the discourse and the design of it to vers. 6. you will find that you cannot fairly

ly

ly turn aside to another, but must needs understand him to this sense, to wit, That the Righteousness which is by Faith, of which he had spoken in vers. 5. is imputed without such Works as make the reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt, mentioned v. 4. His Argument runs thus in other words: They, to whom God imputed Righteousness heretofore, were such as stood in need of forgiveness from God; therefore they could not possibly merit his favour.

And although St. *Paul* doth not improve the words of the Psalmist further than to prove that no man is restored to the Divine favour and the blessedness consequent upon it, without forgiveness of Sins, and that therefore it must needs be of Grace, and not of Debt and Merit that any man attains it by being justified. this being his end in alledging them: Yet it's also evident by the words immediately following those the Apostle here recites, That *Godly sincerity* is the conditional qualification required of such to whom the favour of forgiveness is vouchsafed: For it's there said, *Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose Spirit there is no guile*: No guile notes the *Sincerity* I speak of

of, *Pfal.* 32. 2. And it's to the same sense, when in the writings of the New Testament Faith, as the *Principle* of Sincerity and of the Divine Nature and Life, is made the Condition of Pardon.

And now if what hath been said amounts to any fair account of the Apostle's scope and design in those forementioned verses, and of the sense of the several Phrases by which it is exprest (and I leave you to judge whether it doth or no) then I can see no reason, why by Righteousness imputed without Works we should understand the Righteousness of Christ, but rather the Righteousness of Faith properly understood; which Faith the Apostle there expressly affirms to be imputed for Righteousness, but doth not so much as mention Christ in those verses, much less the imputation of his Righteousness unto Justification, as exclusive of all manner of Works. It is not the Righteousness of Christ, but Grace and Faith, that are in this contexture of Scripture opposed to Works: Nor are Works opposed to Faith neither, but under the notion of *Merit*, as they make the reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace. And when I say this, I do for all that with
all

all thankfulness acknowledge and profess,
 That the Righteousness or Obedience of
 Christ's Life and Death doth with a high
 hand operate to our Justification, and so as
 neither our Faith nor any thing in us, or
 done by us, can do, but in a way altogether
 transcending it, though not in Mr. F's way
 of Imputation; nor is it in this Scripture
 set forth as it is in others.

It's true indeed, the Righteousness the
 Apostle treats of in this place is stiled
 Righteousness *imputed*: But the reason is
 not, because it is not inherent in the persons
 themselves to whom it is imputed, but in
 Christ, and made theirs only by imputati-
 on; for it is the Faith of the Person him-
 self that is here said to be counted or im-
 puted to him for Righteousness. And the
 reason, why it is called a Righteousness *im-*
puted, may be, because it is not naturally,
 and of it self, or in its own nature a Righ-
 teousness that would justify a man, as *Adam's*
 was before his fall, but it is only by Divine
Institution, Grace and Favour that it is so;
God justifies us freely by his Grace, Rom. 3.
 24. *It is of Faith, that it might be by*
Grace, as it follows, Rom. 4. 16. As it is
 by the Justification or Ordinance of a King
 that

that such a piece of Coin passeth current for so much, whether it be of the intrinick value or no, even so by vertue of God's institution, and for Christ's sake, Faith is made to pass for, and to be reckoned and accounted to us for Righteousness, and to entitle us to those benefits, which in its own Nature it doth not merit. If it were a perfect Righteousness in its own Nature, as *Adam's* was, it would need no Pardon to accompany it, as it does, and would secure us as well from temporal as eternal death, which yet it doth not : But it being a Righteousness by Institution and Grace ; how far it shall be beneficial to us, and to what ends and purposes it shall serve, depend wholly upon the good will and pleasure of God, and are knowable only so far to us, as he hath been pleased to put them into promise, by vertue of which promise made upon condition of such Righteousness, and not by merit of the Righteousness it self, we come to have a title to the promised benefits, such as are remission of Sin and eternal Life.

But Mr. F. cannot understand, but that *it is repugnant to the immutability and essential Holiness of God to justify us upon an imperfect*

perfect obedience, the Law commanding that which is perfect, and thinks for him to do so would be to pronounce an unjust person just.

But he should consider, That God in justifying us doth not pronounce us just, as not having sinned (for that's impossible for him indeed to do) but as having performed the Condition, on which he in his Gospel-Covenant hath promised to pardon our Sin. And in doing this he doth not pronounce unjust persons just; for they are just with an Evangelical Righteousness, just in the Gospel sense, and so stiled from place to place in the Scripture, as I have shew'd. And although the Evangelical Righteousness and Obedience, upon which God is pleased to justifie us, be imperfect, if measured by the Law, yet it is perfect as to its end appointed by God, when measured by the Gospel, by which we are to be tryed whether we be righteous or unrighteous: And whosoever (being *adult*) is *not righteous* in this sense, *shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 6 9. but those that are thus *righteous shall go into life eternal*, Matth. 25. 46.

But supposing Evangelical Righteousness or Obedience to be *Comparatively* imperfect

perfect; whether compared with what man in innocency had, and was capable to perform; or whether compared with a gradual perfection of Righteousness and Obedience of the same kind; and supposing it to be only sincere obedience according to the present circumstances a man is in: Let us weigh and consider whether or no it be not consistent with the Holiness of God to justify men upon such Righteousness and Obedience when found in them, when withal we take in what hath been done by Christ the Mediatour to make way for it. I conceive Mr. F. doth not suppose, that God by the Holiness of his Nature is naturally and necessarily restrained from shewing favour to men, after once they have been guilty of Sin, and have made themselves obnoxious to the effects of his high displeasure; for if he were, we were all still in an ill case, and there would be then no such thing as *Grace* extant in the World, which yet is so illustrious and glorious, as that it is the very subject matter of the Gospel. Grace and mercy are as essentially in God as Holiness: And therefore we must take heed of framing such notions of his Holiness as to leave no place for the exercise of his *Grace*
and

and Mercy. God no doubt is at liberty to recede from his own right, as well as men are, in remitting debts and pardoning offences to what degree, and upon what terms he pleaseth, only he, as *Rektor* of the World, hath respect therein unto good order and government.

Supposing all this, we must suppose again that such acts of Grace and Favour towards offending Sinners, as do not in the least encourage them to continue in Sin, nor any other Creature in the whole Creation that is innocent to fall into a state of like Rebellion as man hath done, but are of a quite contrary tendency, will very well consist with the end of his Government, as he is *Rektor* of the World, and with the Righteousness and Justice of the Governor himself. Now the reason and end of executing Justice upon Delinquents is either to recover them themselves to good order and behaviour, or to deter others from falling into like Rebellion against God: For otherwise God *delighteth not in the death* (as such) *of him that dies*, Ezek. 18. Provided then that these ends of Government be secured in shewing favour, the Righteousness and Justice of God will ne-

ver suffer any disparagement, how great soever the Grace and Favour be that is shewed to Offenders. But now that God in justifying men upon account of *sincere* obedience and *inherent* righteousness, considering what hath been done by our Lord Christ to make way for it, and to bring things to that issue, does not in the least countenance Sin past, or encourage to the committing of it for time to come, but that which is altogether contrary thereunto will sufficiently appear, if you consider these two things.

First, That notwithstanding God is so good and gracious, so merciful and ready to forgive as he is, yet he would not grant any terms at all of receiving us into favour again, having once sinned, except his own dear Son himself would take upon him our Nature, and become a Sacrifice, to make an Atonement for our Sin; nor spare him when he had undertaken so to be, notwithstanding that great love wherewith he loved him, but delivered him up to death for us all, when he undertook to become a propitiation for our Sins, rather than we should have no terms of pardon granted. God's granting terms of pardon and re-
stitution

stauration to his favour upon no cheaper terms, did clearly demonstrate him to be an enemy and hater of Sin in the highest, and so irreconcilable to it, as that no Sinner could have any ground to hope to escape the punishment due to it, but upon observing that Condition of escaping it, the obtaining of which cost so dear. In that Christ thus suffered in the flesh, he *condemned Sin in the flesh* (as the phrase is, *Rom. 8. 3.*) and that effectually, and with a witness. Hereby he condemned it in the sight of Heaven and Earth, yea, and of Hell too, as a thing most abominable to God, and contrary to his Nature, and to the goodness and equity of his Laws and Government, when deliverance from the desert of it could be obtained at no cheaper rate or easier terms, than the Son of God his suffering in the Sinners stead ; no not upon repentance it self without this. In that God hath thus *set forth his Son to be a propitiation for Sin through Faith in his Blood, it is to declare his Righteousness in the remission of Sins that are past* (that he is righteous although he forgive) *and that he might be just even when he is the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus,* *Rom. 3. 25, 26.*

Secondly, When God for Christ's sake, and for what he hath done and suffered, did grant terms of Grace, by which we Sinners might come to be justified, pardoned, and saved; yet they were such, and none other, but what tend to *reclaim* us from Sin and Rebellion, and to *reduce* us to obedience, and of Rebels to make us to become good Subjects. And in doing this, God is far from countenancing Sin, or doing any thing disagreeable to the righteousness, wisdom, and goodness of his Government; indeed so far from it, that it highly commends and sets these off.

The terms of favour granted for Christ's sake are such as these; That believing and being perswaded in our own minds that God is good, and ready to forgive for his Son's sake, we heartily repent that ever we rebell'd against him, and that we desist from continuing in our Rebellion any longer, and that we return to our duty, and *sincerely endeavour* to please him in all things for the future. It's true indeed, God knows, that by reason of the wounds and disease we got by our fall, and while we were in rebellion, we have brought so great debility upon our selves, as that
though

though we do return to him, yet we cannot do him such service now, as man was capable of performing before the fall, and his running into rebellion; and therefore he is content for his Son's sake, to accept of such service, as we in this state of weakness and frailty are capable of performing, provided we do the best we well can, and make use of all helps and means afforded us, whereby we may gather strength, and grow better, and do better; and are heartily sorry that ever we have made ourselves so incapable, as we have done, of doing him better service. These and such like are the terms granted us for Christ's sake.

But without some such Change as this God hath not promised to receive any man into favour. Now then, if it be not inconsistent with the righteousness and wisdom of his Government, for God to offer and promise to receive Sinners into favour again upon these terms and conditions (and I cannot think Mr. F. will say it is:) Then it cannot be inconsistent therewith for him to ~~own~~ that they have performed these conditions, when indeed they have, and so to own them now for his true
D 3 and

and faithful Servants and Subjects to their power, and according to the term set in his act of Grace, which is his justifying of them, or the imputing to them for righteousness such their faithful service as they are capable of performing.

These things considered, I dare appeal to Mr. *F's*. better and more impartial Judgment, whether it be not consistent with the Holiness of God to justify men upon the terms aforesaid. I confess I cannot possibly understand, why it should not as well consist with the Holiness of God to justify us upon our believing, and upon our obeying the Gospel too, as it is to do it upon our believing alone: And Mr. *F.* does not think that God doth justify us at all, or impute righteousness to us at all in one sense or another, without our believing. So that the imputation of righteousness to us for our justification, in which sense soever we take it, depends upon our own act in believing, and so likewise is the application of what Christ hath done and suffered for our justification suspended upon our believing. In what Notion soever you understand the application of the righteousness of Christ's life

life and satisfaction of his death to be made ; as whether by being imputed to us in it self, or virtually by having our Faith for the sake thereof imputed to us for Righteousness ; yet still this application depends upon our believing, because God hath made that the condition of it, without which Christ shall profit us nothing.

I take notice further, how Mr. F. by his Notion of having the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us otherwise than in its effects, is led to think and say that our Sins also were otherwise imputed to Christ than in the effects of them. *To say (saith he) that our Sins were imputed to Christ in the effects of them, but not in the guilt, is to contradict all principles of Reason: For guilt and obnoxiousness to punishment being equipollent phrases, he cannot be supposed to be made liable to the last upon the account of our Sins, without having been brought under the first ;* p. 410.

Nor is it imaginable, let me say, how any person should come under the *guilt* of Sin, that hath not been necessary to the *fault* : For guilt implieth two things ; a fault committed by him that is guilty of

it, and the being under an obligation thereby to suffer the punishment due to it, and this obligation of a guilty person to suffer proceeds from the demerit of his fault or crime. And will Mr. F. say that Christ was guilty of our Sins by being in the fault? Or that he came under an obligation to suffer by being in the fault, and from the demerit of the fault? God forbid. Christ was no otherwise obliged to suffer for our Sins, than by his own voluntary consent in concurrence with the will of God his Father, in offering himself as a Sacrifice to make an Atonement by his own Blood. And after this manner indeed by being a Sacrifice the Beasts in time of the Law, that were offered in Sacrifice for Sin, did bear the Sins of those for whom they were offered. But I should think he were little better than a Beast in his understanding, that should say those Beasts were guilty of the Sins of those, for whom they were offered in Sacrifice.

But it's true, as one truth leads to another, so it's too commonly seen, men are tempted to commit one error to defend another, which I think is the Case now before us. Otherwise Mr. F. would hardly

ly have ventured to say Christ was brought under the guilt of our Sins, and had the guilt of them derived upon him, but only the better, as he thought no doubt, to accommodate his Notion of our being in the Innocency and Righteousness of Christ, by having it imputed to us, and derived upon us.

But this is not the only inconvenience that attends this Notion of having the Righteousness of Christ it self imputed to us for our justification, and not only in its happy effects; for it seems to me to oppose the doctrine of forgiveness of Sin: Nay, I pray you consider, whether it doth not evacuate it, and leave no place for such a thing. For if we, in *Mr. F's. Law-sense*, have by Christ paid all the Debt the Law could any wayes demand of us, both in point of obedience and of suffering for our disobedience, by having his obedience and sufferings themselves imputed to us, and not only in the beneficial effects of them: How then, I pray you, can we be said to be forgiven by God, to whom the Debt thus paid was due? Does that man forgive a Debt to me which I have paid him by another, though not by my self? A Legal

gal Discharge I may have in such a case from the Creditour, but no man will say he hath forgiven me my Debt.

I think it will best become us to say, as the Scripture doth, *That God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us* ; and not to say we have paid him what in the rigour of Justice he could demand of us, if not more, to wit, perfect obedience and suffering too, which the Law in its utmost rigour never demanded nor required. We may well and thankfully take up with this, That God, in consideration of what Christ hath become, done, and suffered for our sakes, for our benefit, hath past an Act of Oblivion to remember our Sins and Iniquities no more, provided, and on condition that we repent of our rebellion against God, and return to our Loyalty and Duty in obeying him truly, sincerely, and heartily, as every one doth that so believes, as thereby to become capable of being justified, pardoned and saved.

Furthermore consider I pray you, That if Christ's fulfilling of the Law be so imputed to us, as that we are looked upon as having fulfilled it in him, how could it then be necessary that Christ should dye
for

for our Sins? If we by the imputation of Christ's fulfilling the Law have paid the whole debt of Obedience which was owing to it, we should then owe no debt of Suffering for the breach of it, and consequently Christ would not have needed by suffering to have paid any such Debt for us, no more than for himself, who had no Sin to suffer for.

Again, consider yet further, That if Christ hath paid our whole debt of Obedience to the Law by fulfilling it for us, and then imputing it to us, is there not by this Notion, if admitted, a way paved and prepared for Libertines, to think that then they need not pay it too? to think that God is no such austere Creditour as to exact the same debt twice; first of the Surety, and then of the Principal too? And let me tell you this, Sir, that I have very great reason from my observation formerly, to be confident, that it was from this Opinion, which Mr. F. now defends, touching the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us otherwise than in its blessed effects, that Antinomianism took its first rise among us in this Nation, and Ranterism also out of that. For how else could it be

be possible that men should fancy themselves pure and perfect, and free from all Sin in the midst of those abominations some of them gave themselves up to, but only that they thought themselves to be so by having another's righteousness imputed to them, so as they to become formally righteous by it, as he himself was, save only in the point of imputation. I must confess I cannot think that any Doctrine that is of the Gospel indeed, which is a Doctrine *according to Godliness* in the whole and every part of it, can be so liable, as this is, to natural inferences tending to ungodliness, or to weaken that which is in the Doctrine of Justification rightly understood against Ungodliness.

But on the other hand, when the promise of the great benefits of remission of Sin and eternal Life, is suspended upon our being righteous by a righteousness inherent in us, such as consists in Repentance, Faith, &c. this becomes the greatest motive to Godliness imaginable, and so comports directly with that which is God's great design by the Gospel, which is to recover man again to Happiness by Holiness, from which he first fell by transgression.

But

But that you may have down weight in this Argument, and more if more can be, I will offer one thing more to your consideration, which perhaps may deserve it, and that is, Whether those that deny the inherent Grace of Faith and Sanctification by Faith to be imputed for Righteousness in Justification, (as they usually do, who hold that Christ's Righteousness it self is so imputed) do not thereby make themselves guilty in some respect, and to a degree, of the pernicious error of the false Apostles and Judaizing Christians, for which in the gross they were charged with *falling from Grace*, with making *Christ to become of none effect to them*, and with *perverting the Gospel of Christ*. For I think I shall make it evident that their error lay in two things, (unless you will add thereto their opinion of meriting) the one in denying the necessity of Internal Righteousness unto Justification; the other, in holding an external one in conjunction with Faith in Christ to be sufficient to that end.

Now whether Mr. F. himself doth deny inherent Grace to be *at all* imputed for Righteousness in our Justification, or whether that it *only* is so, I confess I cannot say:

say : But certain it is, that he denies it to be sufficient without the imputation of Christ's Righteousness in the sense of imputation wherein he is opposed. One while he grants that *in reference to the mere demands of the Gospel, we may in a proper sense be said to be justified*; p. 416. At another turn he saith, *that, secluding not only the righteousness of Christ's life, but the satisfaction of his death, as the matter, and the imputation of it as the formal Cause of Justification, it seems repugnant unto the immutability and essential Holiness of God to justify us upon an imperfect obedience* (such as he accounts Evangelical obedience to be) *the Law which requireth a perfect remaining still in force, and denouncing wrath in case of every failure.* By which he seems to hold (how consistently with what I before recited, do you judge) that it is inconsistent with the Holiness of God to justify us upon an Evangelical Righteousness, because imperfect.

But whether Mr. F. joyns the imputation of Christ's Righteousness and the imputation of inherent Grace together in the business of Justification, or whether he wholly denies the imputation of the latter,
and

and affirms only the imputation of the former, I shall not further enquire. But it's well known that those who are wont to plead the same cause with Mr. F. touching the necessity of the imputation of Christ's Righteousness unto Justification, and in that sense wherein he is opposed, are wont also to exclude inherent Grace, as being neither imputed for Righteousness in Justification, nor as necessary thereunto antecedently. Mr. E. Polhill (a Gentleman doubtless of a good Spirit) another of Mr. S's. Antagonists, in his answer to him saith in p. 75. *In Justification no other Righteousness can take place, but the active and passive one of Christ, which answers the pure and righteous Law in every thing.* And in p. 321. he saith, *Obedience to God's commands is indeed the way to Heaven, but its no where made an ingredient into our Justification.* And p. 365. speaking of Phil. 3. 9. saith, *that the Apostle in this place doth not only exclude external Pharisaical righteousness, but even inherent Graces in the matter of Justification.*

And the common opinion of those that have gone that way hath been, That Sanctification is subsequent to Justification, and

and not so much as in order of Nature going before it, or to be any ingredient in it, and consequently not *essentially necessary* to it. Now then, that which I say is this; that if I can make it appear, that the denying the necessity of internal righteousness unto Justification was one part of the grievous error of the Judaizing Christians, it will be enough to spoil the reputation of the same opinion, though found in better men than they were: And whether I shall not make it evidently to appear so to be, I shall leave you to judge, after you have weighed what I shall now lay before you.

Their Crime was, I conceive, a partial revolt or turning unto the worst of Judaism, saving their retaining a profession of Faith in Christ; to think that an external righteousness without an internal, was available to justification and salvation. The unbelieving Jews, to whom they turned in part, were quite degenerated from their worthy Ancestors, and all that remained faithful among them, who all held the internal Grace of Love to God, fear of him, uprightness of heart towards him, truth in the inward parts, 'necessary to interest
them

them in his favour, and the blessing of the everlasting Covenant.

But the degenerate Jews thought an external Righteousness, such as *Paul* had while a Pharisee, and such as would justify them in the sight of men, according to the terms of the political Covenant, by which they were externally governed by God as they were his Commonwealth, would justify them as to their eternal estate. Of which grand mistake our Saviour (*Matth. 5.*) laboured to convince them, by shewing that no less was required by God in order to that, than an *inward purity*, and upbraided them with their making clean the *outside* of the Cup and Platter, when *within* they were full of extortion and excess, of ravening and wickedness; with their appearing *outwardly* Righteous unto men, when *within* they were full of Hypocrisie and iniquity, and told his hearers that *except their Righteousness exceeded theirs, they should never enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: that except they were born again they could not see the Kingdom of God.*

Now it was to this monstrously corrupt part of Judaism to which the Judaising Christians did revolt, or turn rather

(for many of them were Gentiles,) because without this, their error in adhering to the Law of *Moses* as necessary to be observed, would not have been so damnable as the Scripture represents it to be, calling it a *perverting the Gospel of Christ*, a being *removed to another Gospel*, a *falling from Grace*, a *making of Christ to become of none effect to them*, (*Gal. 1. 7. and 5. 2, 4*) which it would not have been, if there had been nothing else in it than a perswasion that they were under an obligation of observing the Law of *Moses*, as well as the Law of Christ.

For there were many thousands of the Jews which believed, who were yet zealous of the Law of *Moses*, and thought themselves still under the obligation of it, (*Acts 21.*) who yet could never be said upon that account to be fallen from Grace, or to be removed from the Gospel of Christ to another Gospel, so long as they were *really* for an *internal* Righteousness as *necessary* to Justification and Salvation, as well as an external. For all the faithful Jews under the Law, before the Law and after the Law, yea and all the Gentiles too, that had this internal Righteousness, as well as
an

an external, were all justified through the Grace of God exhibited in the universal Covenant made in Christ, and granted for his sake, whether they had any explicite or distinct knowledge of that Covenant, or not, or of Christ in whom it was confirmed. *In every Nation he that feareth God and worketh Righteousness is accepted of him: and if the Uncircumcision did but keep the righteousness of the Law, the internal Righteousness designed by it, their Uncircumcision was counted for Circumcision.*

When on the other hand *he was not a Jew* at any time (in the sense there spoken of) *who was one outwardly in the flesh only, but he was a Jew which was so inwardly, and Circumcision was that of the heart in the Spirit of the Law, and not in the Letter only, whose praise or approbation was from God, whether it were from men or no, Rom. 2.*

St. Paul would never have become as a Jew to the Jews to gain the Jews, as he did in observing Jewish Rites (*Acts 21.*) and in circumcising *Timothy*: nor have said as he did, that *God had received* such Christian Jews, who yet made Conscience of Jewish difference and distinction of meats

and dayes (Rom. 14.) if a mere perswasion of being under the obligation of the Law of *Moses* had been so dangerous and damnable, as he affirms the errour of the Judaizing Christians to be.

The very nature of the opposition, which the Apostles made against the errour of the Judaizing Christians in their Epistles to the Churches among whom they were, sufficiently discovers to us the nature of their errour to be the placing Justification in an *external* Righteousness, and not in an *internal*. When St. Paul had said, if they were Circumcised Christ should profit them nothing, and that they were fallen from Grace that would be justified by the Law, and that the true Christians waited for the hope of the Righteousness which is by Faith, or which Faith produceth; he gives this reason of all, saying; *For in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith which worketh by Love, i. e. by causing Love to God and Men, Gal. 5.* And again, *for in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a new Creature, Gal. 6. 15.* And if any man be in Christ, he's a new Creature, 2 Cor. 5. 17.

And

And the Gospel is declared by St Paul to be *the ministration of Righteousness, not in the Letter of the Law, but in the Spirit* or internal Righteousness which was required in the Law, and more plainly and expressly in the Gospel, 2 Cor. 3. and that Christians must *serve in newness of Spirit, and not in the oldness of the Letter.* And the benefits of the new Covenant of having God to be our God, and our Sins pardoned, belong only to them who have his *Laws put in their mind, and written in their heart, Heb. 8.* And that those, *who are born after the Spirit* by regeneration, are *Children according to promise* or tenour of the New Covenant, when as those, *who were born after the flesh*, and adhering only to the Letter of the Law for an external Righteousness, were *Children of the flesh*, or Legal Political Covenant: And this is set forth in an Allegory touching the two Covenants, Gal. 4.

All this serves not only to let us see the nature of that Righteousness, by which the Judaizing Christians could not be justified as they *expected*, but also by way of opposition to that, truly and plainly to represent to us the nature of that Evangelical Right-

teousness, by which (in subordination to Christ's Righteousness) we must be justified if ever justified ; both which doubtless were the true design of the Scriptures I have brought together, that you might see the harmony and concurrent testimony of the Scriptures in this matter.

By this time I presume you perceive, that the difference between the two sorts of Judaizing Christians, the better and the worse, lay much in this one point, to wit, that the one did, and the other did not hold *internal* Righteousness necessary to Justification: For, excepting in this, they seem both to have been of one mind, both in professing Faith in Christ, and in holding themselves under the obligation of the Law of *Moses* for Circumcision and other Legal Rites. Now then, if that very thing made so great a difference between them, as I have shew'd, what shall we then think of that opinion, by which some better men among us than the corrupt Judaizing Christians were do thus far agree and fall in with them, as they do in denying internal Righteousness of inherent Grace to be necessary to our Justification, or that it doth enter it, or is any ingredient in it, but

but think it perfectly subsequent to it, not so much as admitting it to take place, or to come into being, until we are first justified; nor so much as admitting that Faith in it self is imputed for Righteousness, but only the Righteousness of Christ as apprehended by Faith: I say, what shall we think of this? Can we possibly think the same opinion to be a grievous error in the Judaizing Christians, and yet to be Orthodox and innocent in others?

Doubtless where this opinion is as practically held as it was by the corrupter sort of the Judaizing Christians, it is as criminal and dangerous as it was in them; but so it is not, I confess, where it is held only speculatively, as I suppose it to be by all those of that persuasion that are Regenerate and truly good. For they hold Regeneration and the inherent Grace of Sanctification necessary to Salvation, though not to Justification; and in holding this they practically hold it necessary to Justification, even then while in speculation and opinion they hold no absolute necessity of it in order thereto. For the practising upon this better principle, as believing Regeneration and Sanctification ne-

cessary to Salvation, and becoming Regenerate, Sanctified, and internally Righteous thereupon, they come thereby to have this Evangelical Righteousness imputed to them for such as it is, that is for Righteousness; for so it is in the eye, and according to the tenour of the Evangelical Law; which Imputation is their Justification. This God does, although they do not know and believe all this, but think they were justified before they were sanctified (which by interpretation is to think they were accounted righteous before they were so) that they were accounted righteous in the Righteousness of another, before they were at all righteous in themselves. But God proceeds in justifying men, not according to by-opinions in men, while consistent with real Holiness, but according to what they are indeed and in truth in the *temper* of their hearts, and *tenour* of their lives.

I have said thus much to ease those of the opinion I oppose, as much as I can. For by reason that it is counter-ballanced by better principles in many, it is not so dangerous in them as it was in the corrupt Judaising Christians. It was in them indeed mort-

mortiferous and damnable if practised upon and persisted in, because there was in them no such thing to counter-balance it in its operation, as a perswasion of the necessity of internal Righteousness unto Salvation, no more than unto Justification, as there is in these.

And in this very respect, and their opinion of merit, doubtless it was, that the promoters of this grand error were charged with perverting the Gospel of Christ, and those that practically adhered to them therein, with falling from Grace, and depriving themselves of the benefit of Christ's death. And the reason of this is plain; because the Grace of God in the Gospel is *limited* and restrained in the *last issue* and *event* unto mens becoming *Regenerate* and internally righteous, as the *condition without which* they shall neither be *justified*, pardoned, nor saved by the *death* of Christ, or *any thing* he hath done for the Salvation of Sinners. And therefore those false Teachers, that taught Justification and Salvation attainable by Christ without such internal Righteousness, might well be charged with perverting the Gospel of Christ, and those Christians with falling from

from Grace, who closed with them in that opinion: For therein they departed and fell off from the true Notion and Idea of the Grace of the Gospel, and the terms on which all the saving benefits are in the Gospel promised by Jesus Christ.

Now although this opinion of the non-necessity of the inherent Grace of Sanctification unto Justification is check't and controlled in its operation in those that are full of the sense of the necessity of it unto Salvation; yet by what hath been now represented it seems in it self, and *abstracted* from the *better* principle I have mentioned, to be the *first step* towards falling from Grace in the sense before explained, and is of dangerous consequence, when it takes place in men who have no such *sense* of the necessity of internal Sanctification unto Salvation. For in such case, Libertines and Carnal men will be apt to bear up themselves in hope (as is much to be feared they too frequently do) that if their believing *only*, abstracted from its effects in renewing men, be *sufficient* to *procure* the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to them for their Justification in the sight of God, or otherwise of it *self* to obtain it, that then it will be

be sufficient also to *save* them, in as much as the Scripture saith, *whom God justifieth, them he also glorifieth*, and stileth the Justification of men, *Justification unto life*, and if *God justifie*, *who is he that condemneth*? And in this very respect, it is much to be feared, that this opinion too frequently becomes a snare of Death, and a stumbling stone to many, to content themselves with that which is but a dead Faith, and some external form of Devotion and Righteousness without the internal, in mortifying all inordinate affection, and in governing their thoughts and passions; and to think themselves safe and in a good condition upon account of that, to the betraying of their Souls to destruction. And whether it may not be pronounced concerning all those who expect Justification and Salvation upon account of their believing and hoping in Christ, and of an external Righteousness without an internal, that they are fallen from Grace, and that Christ shall profit them nothing, as well as it was concerning the corrupt Judaising Christians, is a question I think you will easily resolve.

When

When we see then how fatal it was to the unbelieving Jews and Judaizing Christians to *mistake* the *tenour* of God's Covenant, and the *nature* of the Covenant-Righteousness, and to introduce a Righteousness of *another kind* into the *place and office* of the *internal Righteousness* which is by Faith, it may well make wary men cautious, how they entertain any opinion that is in any degree like unto it.

It hath been a *mistake* of the Scriptures about the *nature and kind* of the Evangelical-Covenant-Righteousness, that hath *occasioned* our Disputes about it in these latter times, as well as it did among Christians in the Apostles times, though the difference hath not been altogether so great, nor perhaps so dangerous now as it was then. And if it may not be burthensome to you, I will very briefly give you yet some farther account of my thoughts and apprehensions of the nature of this Righteousness, and of the sense and meaning of some of those Scriptures that treat of it, and have been mistaken on the one side, or on the other.

The tenour of God's Grace in the Gospel is to exhibit, declare, and shew, that since man by his fall hath made the enjoyment of felicity, and the avoiding of misery, by perfect sinless obedience, impracticable, that yet God will for Christ's sake, as having undertaken for us, receive him into favour again upon condition that he do but heartily desire, resolve, and sincerely endeavour for the future to become obedient, and to please him in all things so far as he is able with the helps and assistances internal and external, which God will vouchsafe, and heartily repent that ever he did otherwise; and that upon the same condition he will pardon all past sins and future failings also, so far as they are consistent with sincerity of Love and Obedience. This is summarily the glad tidings which by the Gospel is published to the World.

And a practical belief of this glad Tidings is that which God accounts unto men for Righteousness, as being the New-Covenant-Righteousness. And that's a practical belief of it, when men so believe it as to practise according to it, in repenting and sincerely obeying, in hope of the promised

promised benefits. And this *godly sincerity* is the Righteousness of the New Covenant or Gospel, as distinguished from the Righteousness which is of the Law, either as that imports perfect sinless obedience, or else only an external Pharisaical Righteousness.

The Evangelical Righteousness afore described, is in the New Testament sometimes stiled the Righteousness of God, as opposed to the unbelieving Jews and corrupt Judaizing Christians *own* external Pharisaical Righteousness, *Rom. 10. 3. Phil. 3. 9.* And this is called their *own* Righteousness, as being only of their *own chusing*, and not of God's appointing, as the condition on which they *promised themselves* Justification in the sight of God, when he had *promised them no such thing*. And the internal with the external Righteousness of godly sincerity is called *the Righteousness of God*, and *the Righteousness which is of God*, partly because it is of his *institution*, and partly because it is of his *operation*. It is the Righteousness of God, because it is of his *institution*. He hath in and by the New Covenant ordained, That this shall be accounted and taken for that Righteousness upon

Upon which he will accept men as Righteous, and justify them as such against all condemnatory accusations : This is his Institution and Revelation in the Gospel, in which this *Righteousness of God* is said to *be revealed from faith to faith*, Rom. 1. 17. to wit, as that which is the object of Faith, or that which is to be believed to be the stated terms on which God will now justify and save men. And that it is meant of a Righteousness inherent in men, the rather appears by the antithesis in the next words, where on the contrary it's said, *the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men* ; Where the ungodliness and *unrighteousness of men*, is put in opposition to the *Righteousness of God*.

It is the Righteousness of God also, because it is of his *operation* and working in us. It is of his *Creation*, and therefore called the *new Creature*, the *new man created after the Image of God in Righteousness and true Holiness*, the *Divine nature*, begotten of God by the word of Truth, born, not of the will of man, or of the will of the flesh, but of God. And it being of his institution and operation, it must needs be of his

his approbation too. This Evangelical Righteousness is called the *Righteousness of God* in the same sense in which the Christian life is called the *life of God*, *Ephes 4.18.* not the life which he himself lives, but the life which he commands, and the life which by his Grace he enables men to live. As the Sacrament is called the *Supper of the Lord*, because it is of his *institution*: so is this inherent Righteousness and Justification by it, said to be the *Righteousness of God* for the same reason.

To restore fallen man to this Righteousness, and to acceptation with God and Justification thereby, and to render him capable of the happiness designed him in another World, was the reason of sending Christ into the World, and of his suffering for us, and of all the rest of his Mediatory undertaking.

For that I take to be the plain meaning of 2 Cor. 5.21 *.

He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the

* (When I compare the foregoing verses therewith, noting God's design of reconciling us to himself by Christ, which is done by an inward change of mind and will.)

Righteousness of God in him, that is, by means of him. Parallel to which is 1 Pet.

3. 18. *Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.*

This inherent Righteousness is called the Righteousness which is *of God by Faith*, because it proceeds from God by the means of Faith, and not without it, *Rom. 3. 22. Phil. 3. 9.* by believing that God will justify and save men by Jesus Christ in this way, and upon these terms of becoming inherently righteous, and not otherwise, men come to be so, that they may be justified and saved.

I have the rather given this brief Gloss upon these Scriptures, because I find Mr. *Polhill* still, as others have done before him, will needs understand that this Righteousness is meant of the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and that it is called the Righteousness *of God*, because it is the Righteousness of *Christ, which is God*. But methinks he and they should consider, that because the Righteousness of Christ is the Righteousness of him that is God as well as Man, that therefore it is nowise likely it should ever be imputed to us any otherwise than in its blessed effects, and consequently that which they surmise cannot be the sense

of the Scriptures aforementioned. For as such it is a *mediatorial righteousness*, a Righteousness resulting from his conformity to the *Law of his Mediation*, which was a Law peculiar to himself alone. And it seems very rational to think this righteousness no more communicable to us, otherwise than in its happy effects, than the acts and office of his Mediation are. And although, upon the account of its being so transcendent and glorious a righteousness, it is a very great ground of consolation and of confidence to us, that for the sake of it our Evangelical righteousness will be accepted with God, and all our defects, so far as consistent with sincerity, freely pardoned, yet it is a great question, whether it will agree with Christian modesty to presume our selves invested therewith, any otherwise than in the beneficial effects of it, unless there were more ground for it than we can find in Scripture. We may well bethink our selves, whether it be not a Garment too rich and glorious for us to wear, and proper only for the person of the Mediatour, the Son of God himself.

If it shall yet be demanded, that if this be true, that we are justified upon account
of

pinefs without reconciling us to himfelf, and being reconciled to us: Nor how he fhould reconcile us to himfelf without making fome Overtures of Grace to us: Nor how he fhould be reconciled to us without our fubmitting to his terms of Grace. And if not, I can eafily fhew you that we cannot be *affected* and wrought upon by God's *overture and offer* of Grace, fo as to answer his end in making it, *nor fubmit to*, or comply with his terms of Grace without believing; and confequently that the execution of God's design in reftoring us to happinefs, and of glorifying the riches of his Grace therein, depends very much upon *Faith*, and more on that, than on any other Grace or Vertue whatfoever.

First, We cannot be *affected* and wrought upon with God's *offer* of Grace, fo as to give him the glory of it in thankful acceptance, due acknowledgments, and futable returns in loving him that fhewed fuch love to us, without this Grace of Faith. For the *fenfe* of God's Grace in offering to finners, through Chrift, pardon, reftauration to his favour, and falvation at laft, upon condition of repentance, cannot *enter* into the heart of man, but by Faith. And the
 reafon

reason hereof is, because the offer of Grace, and the things offered by Grace, are matter of *supernatural revelation*, which do not further affect, than they are believed, as I shall farther shew in the next particular.

But by believing that God of mere Grace in and by Christ hath promised pardon, acceptance into favour, the assistance of his Spirit, and eternal life unto Sinners (otherwise under condemnation) upon condition of repentance and a sincere returning unto God; I say by this belief we come to trust in, and rely upon that Grace, and on Christ as an All-sufficient Saviour for those promised benefits, even in the performance of that Condition, and that in opposition to all opinion of meriting them by that performance, or by any thing we can do. And it is by this belief and affiance that God receives from us the glory of his Grace, and Christ the honour of his performance for us: which answers one of the great ends designed by our recovery; for which cause it may very well be one reason why this Faith, rather than any other Grace, is said to be imputed to us for Righteousness. For we are told expressly, *that it is of Faith that it might be by Grace*, Rom. 4. 16. That

is, to cut off all pretence of merit, the same saving benefits are promised, and on the same Condition, to wit, that of Faith, to Heathen Idolaters, *Sinners of the Gentiles*, as was to the strictest observers of the Law of *Moses*: The reason in the close of the verse, gives that to be the meaning. And accordingly Faith, whether it be in one that hath been a great sinner, or in one of a more inoffensive life, hath God's Grace, not Man's merit, for its object on which it doth depend for all, and accordingly attributes and ascribes all to it, *Gal. 2. 15, 16*. Which is one reason we see of God's electing of it to be the Condition, on which his great and precious promises are made, and may well be a reason also of his imputing it to men for Righteousness when they do believe.

For by the account we have why *Abraham's* Faith was imputed to him for Righteousness, we have reason to believe that our giving to God the glory of his Grace and Goodness, Truth and Power, by this belief and affiance, and to Christ the honour of his undertaking, is of such high acceptation with God, as that he of his goodness is pleased to honour and reward
it

it by imputing it to us for Righteousness. For we see when *Abraham's* Faith in God's promise, touching a numerous Issue, had nothing to lean upon but the Goodness, Veracity, and Power of God, and that these carried it with *Abraham* against all doubts and objections that might arise from the utmost humane and natural improbabilities of ever coming to pass, so that *he gave glory to God in being fully persuaded, that what he had promised he was able also to perform*; that *St. Paul* hath told us that *therefore, or for this very cause, his Faith was imputed to him for righteousness, Rom. 4. 21, 22.*

But the glorifying the riches of his Grace was not all that God had in design in our recovery, but also the Renovation of our nature, and the restoring us to happiness thereby: And Faith is as necessary and useful for the accomplishing this part of God's design, as it was to effect the other, and therefore *secondly*, this may be another Reason why Faith is imputed for Righteousness, and why it's said to be so, rather than any other Grace.

Without believing we cannot *comply* with the terms and condition on which Pardon

and Salvation are promised, and without which they are not to be had, and that is in being renewed in our nature. For without believing those Motives that tend to persuade us to comply with, and submit to the terms or condition, on which God for Christ's sake hath promised to pardon us, to receive us into favour, and finally to save us, we can never actually comply with those terms or that condition, and consequently without that can never be capable of receiving the benefits promised on that condition.

For it is Faith, as it *takes in those Motives* in their strength and persuasive efficacy, that becomes a vigorous and operative principle of all other Graces, Repentance, Love, Obedience, and the like, by which our nature becomes renewed: All which depend upon our believing. And therefore well may our Faith be named and put for all the rest, as comprehending them in it, when it, rather than any other Grace, is said to be imputed for Righteousness. To make this evident, I shall suggest two things to you.

1. That they are the great *Motives* of the Gospel, the Grace of God and Love of Christ

Christ to lost man, the good hoped for, and the evil feared, the good promised to those that are good, and the evil threatned to those that are evil, that *operate* upon the mind and will in men, to the producing that change in them, by which they become new men, sincerely good men. *If we love God, it is because he loved us first, 1 John 4. 19.* If we live to Christ that died for us, it is because the love of Christ constrains us, 2 Cor. 5. 14. If we are made partakers of a Divine Nature, it is by the great and pretious promises that we are so, 2 Pet. 1. 4.

And 2. the operation of these *Motives* of the Gospel upon the mind depends upon our believing, and so consequently do all those happy effects in heart and life, which are produced by the operation of those Motives. For until the reality of those Motives are believed, they have *no existence* or being in the Soul, and where they have no being they have *no operation*. *The Word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with Faith in them that heard it, Heb. 4. 2.* The Love, Grace, and Favour of God to Sinners, in giving Christ for us, and of his Love in giving himself for us, and intending and promising us the benefit of pardon
and

and salvation thereby only upon condition of our Repentance and Conversion unto God, being all of them things *invisible*, and not objects of sense, do not affect us, or persuade us to repent, and in good earnest turn to God, that we may be pardoned and saved, until we really *believe* these things. It is our Faith, or the credit we give to the Revelation which God hath made of these things, that gives them an existence or being in the Soul, and upon that depends the efficacy and power of their prevailing with us to become new men. *Faith is the substance or subsistence of things hoped for, and the evidence or conviction of things not seen, Heb. 11. 1.* Unless men first believe that God is so good, merciful, and gracious to men, notwithstanding they have sinned against him, as to pardon and save them, if they repent and become sincerely obedient for the future, and not otherwise, they will never deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, when they are solicited thereby to gratify the flesh. Men must first *believe that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him* indeed, before they will seek his Grace and Favour by becoming such, and doing that upon which,

and

and not without which, he hath more or less declared his Grace and Favour is to be obtained and found. *Without this Faith it is impossible to please God*; it is impossible to leave off those things by which they have displeased him, and to betake themselves to do those things that are pleasing in his sight, *Heb. 11. 6.*

It was the belief that all good men had before the Law and under the Law, that God would *keep Covenant and mercy with those that love him and keep his Commandments*, and not otherwise, that brought them so to love him and to keep his Commandments. It was their belief that *there is forgiveness with him that he might be feared*, as an encouragement to men to fear him, that prevailed with them to fear him indeed, *Psal. 130. 4.* It was the *hope* which even the Heathen *Ninevites* had (from the natural Notion they had of God, and from their observation of his general and common goodness to the World, notwithstanding mens sins) that if they did but repent and leave their sins, forgiveness might possibly be obtained, that caused them to *turn from their evil way, and from the violence that was in their hands*, *Jona. 3. 8, 10.*

Now

Now then, since so much as you see *depends* upon *Faith*, as Repentance, Conversion, Regeneration, and all inherent Righteousness and Holiness of living, there is great reason why it should usually be mentioned, as that which is imputed for Righteousness, rather than any other inherent Grace, and in the name, and as the representative of all the rest, as being the productive cause of them all.

By the way you may observe then, that since it is as you see the Operation of the great *Motives* of the Gospel as believed, that in conjunction with the operation of the Holy Spirit effects that great Change in men, by which they become regularly capable of all the blessedness of pardon and salvation which the Gospel reveals, it must needs be very *necessary* for such as you, who are ministers of the Gospel, to *insist* much upon those *Motives* in your discourses to the people, and to inculcate and work them into their minds. To set life and death, heaven and hell before them, and to convince them of the reality of such a future state, and of the *inseparable connexion* that is between happiness and their duty, and between a sinful and hypocritical life,
and

and their eternal misery. And to convince them that every one shall *have* in the next World according as he *chuseth* in this, he that chuseth the right *way* shall come to the right and best *end*, as he that chuseth the wrong shall certainly come to the wrong and worst, and that every he that shall perish hereafter, is a self murderer.

And likewise to set in the peoples eye the *preventing grace of God*, what he hath already done for us, as a most affecting motive tending to reconcile us to him, and to think well of him, as of one that never sought our ruin, but as pitying us, and taking compassion on us, when we had brought it upon our selves, and not pursuing the advantage we have given him against us, nor revenging himself on us. But contrarily contriving a way of our recovery from sin, and from the misery into which that hath brought us, yea, though it cost him very dear to do it, in giving his Son to dye for us, when he could not otherwise do it with *satisfaction* to himself in reference to the honour of his Government.

Be-

Besides, he hath done this for us men, and for our salvation, when he hath past by the fallen Angels: Christ the Son of God did not take hold of Angels, the Apostate Spirits, to rescue them out of that destruction and misery into which they plunged themselves, and yet hath taken hold of the seed of *Abraham*, of the humane nature, to rescue and pluck mankind out of the horrible pit of destruction, into which we were fallen, *Heb. 2. 16.*

And now, is not all this Grace of God and Love of Christ, which thus far is unconditionate, and absolutely free and unsought for on our part, and altogether antecedent to any thing done by us to obtain it, a wonderful motive thankfully and joyfully to accept of those most reasonable and gracious terms of our Recovery, which God in the Gospel hath offered us?

When it shall be considered, that God of his mere commiseration and compassion towards us, hath now tried us once again, when we were all but as dead men before him, and hath put us in a way once again of being happy; with what face can we slight, despise, and abuse such Love,

Love by rejecting those gracious terms of reconciliation, that were procured for us on such costly terms as the sufferings of the Son of God amount unto? But if we do, and after all this will persist in our rebellion against Heaven, how can we possibly expect that any other way or terms of pardon and salvation should ever be offered unto us again? *How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation*, and so mercifully and freely offered us, and that on no harder conditions neither, than to cease our wilful rebellion against God, and to become dutiful and loyal under his easie yoke and gentle Government by the Evangelical Law? *Heb. 2. 3.*

If then such mighty Motives as the Love of God, and his Son Christ Jesus our Lord, so wonderfully exprest, and the hope of Heaven, and the fear of Hell, will not work upon us to repent, to change our minds, and amend our lives, and to become new Creatures; what greater Motives, think we, can God use to persuade men by? Doubtless they are these Motives will do it, if any thing will do it: and for that reason they should (as I said) be insisted on by those, whose special business

ness appointed them by God is to win Souls.

And as these Motives should be much and often inculcated upon the minds of the people for the reason aforesaid, so for the same reason they should be managed with all the advantage, in respect of circumstance, that can be thought on, to reach their end, in operating powerfully upon the people's Souls. Such for one is *plainness of speech*, as the phrase is, 2 Cor. 3. 12. and not as *Moses*, who put a vail over his face. By which plainness of speech (if it be what I mean) things are fitted and prepared for the understanding and capacity of the meanest, whose salvation God hath designed as much as the salvation of the more learned and wise. If *Peter* will express his love to his Master indeed, he must as well feed his Lambs as his Sheep; *Joh. 21. 15.*

And by how much the more matters so affecting in themselves, as the Motives of the Gospel are, are delivered with an *inward sense, seriousness and gravity*, by so much the more they will command attention and consideration from the people, and the sooner *sink down into their hearts,*
and

and the more powerfully operate upon the mind and will.

And if the experience of many (among whom I number my self) be of any consideration in place of proof, then the *intermixing Scripture Texts* in Divine Discourses, aptly applyed, and wisely managed, is much more edifying to the people, than such Discourses without that can be, though otherwise for the matter of them, they may be agreeable to the Scripture. For besides that so doing greatly helps memory and retention of the matter, without which the operation of the matter vanisheth with the matter it self: And besides also the benefit of growing thereby into better acquaintance with the Scriptures, the Mine of these Motives of which I speak, and of becoming able by use to reduce scattered Texts of one and the same import to heads of Doctrine; I say besides all this, and more which might be said, it tends greatly to *bind* the matter delivered the faster upon the Conscience, when it shall come so visibly armed with authority from

G Heaven,

Heaven, as by that means it does ; and when the Laws and Statutes of that Kingdom shall be produced, laid open, and urged to make it good and enforce it. The Scriptures themselves will be found of more authority in the Consciences of men, than the best words men can speak, though never so rational and true. In a word, as *Apollos* was a man *mighty in the Scriptures*, so he *mightily convinced* his hearers *by the Scriptures*, *Acts* 18.24,28. I need not mention unto you how much it was *St. Paul's* manner to reason out of the Scriptures of the old Testament, before those of the New were in being, when he had to do with those that owned them, *Acts* 17.2. and 28.23. Nor how our Lord Christ himself collected and brought together the things concerning himself, which were scattered up and down in *Moses* and the Prophets, and expounded them to his Disciples, and thereby opened their understandings, and caused their hearts to burn within them ; and that, I think, is not unlike the operation of the Motives of the Gospel I have been speaking of, *Luke* 24.27, 32,45,46. There

There is one thing more which I must add to obviate an objection; and another to explain and confirm something I have asserted. I know some, and perhaps your self, will be ready to object, That the tenour of my reasoning touching God's imputing Faith it self, and other inherent Grace for Righteousness in justifying men, tends to confound Justification and Sanctification, and to make them all one. But that follows not at all: For Sanctification is the constituting or making men Evangelically righteous or holy by the joint operation of God's Holy Spirit, and the Evangelical Doctrine; but Justification is God's pronouncing or declaring them, as he doth in the Gospel, to be righteous according to the terms of the Gospel, as having performed the condition upon which forgiveness of Sin and eternal Life are therein promised.

Justification is a Juridical act of God as Judge, which doth not make a man righteous as sanctification doth, but upon tryal pronounceth him to be so, and by it the person tried is acquitted and

discharged from the accusation of unbelief, impenitency, and wilful disobedience to the Gospel, and so also from Condemnation it self. So that Justification is not Sanctification, but supposeth it as antecedent thereunto, at least in order of nature. *Whom he called them he also justified*, saith St. Paul, *and whom he justified them he also glorified*, Rom. 8. 30. He doth not say, whom he justified them he also sanctified, but them also he glorified. Sanctification is not brought in between Justification and Glorification in that golden Chain, but is placed in order as going before both in effectual calling.

The other thing I would add for explanation and confirmation is this: Whereas I have said that the Faith which is imputed for Righteousness, is comprehensive of Repentance and Obedience to the Gospel: Now lest you should not be satisfied therewith, I shall give you this plain account why we cannot reasonably understand otherwise. For the Scripture doth exclude such from sharing in the saving benefits of the Covenant, as are
im-

impenitent, unregenerate, and disobedient to the Gospel, *Luke 13. 3. Joh. 3. 3. Rom. 2. 8.* And if so, then no man can share in those saving benefits, whereof Justification is one, until his Faith doth produce Repentance, Regeneration, and Obedience, unless you will suppose that which no man does, that these are no effects of Faith, For he that believes is born of God, is to a degree renewed to his likeness, *1 John 5. 1.*

And when I say thus, I am not of opinion that men cannot be justified until they have fulfilled some time in a course of holy living and new obedience, internal and external. But when a man so believes, as that such a real change is thereby wrought in the heart, as is the beginning of a new life for the present, and the foundation of a holy life for the future, then undoubtedly he passeth out of an unjustified into a justified state. This change in the mind and will by means of Faith, doth first constitute a man a good man; and when this change first takes place, then God's *Laws* are first put into the mind, and

written in the heart, upon which God promiseth in the New Covenant to be our God, and that we shall be his People, and that he will be merciful to our unrighteousness, and our sins and iniquities to remember no more, Hebr. 8. 10, 12. and 10. 16, 17.

And it is observable, that the qualification upon which God in the New Covenant here mentioned, promiseth to be our God, and to forgive our sins, is not mentioned under the Name or Notion of Faith or Believing, but of having the Divine Laws put into the mind, and written in the heart. Which would be somewhat strange, if this writing the Law in the heart were no part of the Condition, without which God will not vouchsafe unto any man that great benefit of the Covenant, Justification.

There is no doubt indeed, but that though Faith be not here mentioned, yet it is supposed and implied, in as much as without it the Law cannot be written in the heart in the sense we speak of it now.

But then, when at other times Faith only is mentioned, as that which quali-
fies

fies men for Justification, and as the Condition of the promise of Pardon and Salvation, yet then this writing of the Law in the heart is also to be understood. For it is not to be imagined, that the putting of the Law into the mind, and writing it in the heart, would be mentioned in a description of the tenour of the New Covenant, as that qualification upon which God will be our God, take us for his people, and forgive our sins, (which imply Justification) if any Faith, or Faith in any respect short of producing this effect, would be available and sufficient unto Justification.

It's true, the Scripture in some places tells us that Faith is imputed for Righteousness, without telling us what, or what manner of Faith this is: But then in other places it is plainly described to us by the nature of its operation, as that *it purifieth the heart*, Acts 15. 9. *worketh by love*, Gal. 5. 6. *overcometh the world*, 1 John 5. 4. and *sanctifieth the whole man*, Acts 26. 18.

We see then, that the inseparable effects of Faith, as here the writing of the Law in the heart, are sometimes mentioned as those things which qualify us for the blessing of the Covenant, and sometimes Faith it self only. But if we will take the whole testimony of the Scriptures together, we shall find that both are intended: And why then should we contend, as some do, about dividing these in qualifying us for Justification, as parts of that Evangelical Righteousness which will be imputed to us for Righteousness?

After all this, let me tell you, Sir, That there is a sense in which it is not disagreeable to the Scripture, to say that a man is justified by such acts of Evangelical Righteousness or Obedience, as do not take place till long after he first believes, and believes to Justification. And thus *Abraham's* believing, mentioned *Gen. 15. 6.* which was not until some years after he first believed, is said to be imputed to him for Righteousness. And many years after that again he was justified by yielding obedience to God's Command about offer-

offering his Son, *James* 2. 21. And somewhat of like nature is also said of *Noah*, *Heb.* 11. 7. compared with *Gen.* 6. 9, 22.

But these things are said, I conceive, in reference to the continuance of their Justification, and not to their Justification at first. For as those acts of believing, repenting, &c. which do first constitute a man a new Creature, are at first imputed to him for Righteousness, so all after-acts of Evangelical Obedience and of Faith it self are still imputed to him for Righteousness to the continuance of his Justification. To which agrees that reading of *Revel.* 22. 11. which runs thus, *let him that is righteous be justified still; and the Righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith*, *Rom.* 1. 17.

But otherwise, if the righteous turneth away from his Righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doth, all the Righteousness which he hath done shall not be mentioned: In his trespass which he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die,

die, Ezek. 18. 24. Again, when I say to the righteous he shall surely live; if he trust to his own Righteousness (i. e. his former Righteousness) and commit iniquity, all his Righteousness shall not be remembered, Ezek. 33. 13. Now the just shall live by faith, but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him, Hebr. 10. 38. If then you do but consider upon what terms men are at first justified, and upon what terms they continue to be so afterwards, you will easily perceive it to be a great and most important truth to say, That we are justified by believing and obeying the Gospel.

These things, Sir, which I have thus done by way of Essay, without regard to method, I submit to your consideration. I know right-well it's in vain, if I had a mind to it (which yet I am far from) to impose upon you, or to persuade you to receive any thing for truth farther than it brings it's evidence to be so along with it. And it were to wished that every one were able to discern
when

when it doth so: But that's a thing rather to be desired, than expected in this our present state in this World. But it's Argument enough to treat one another so almost as if we did, if we have not apparent reason to think we are but insincere and dissembling friends to Truth, and love it not for it self, nor any further, than it will accommodate us in some secular or carnal respect or other: and it is not easie to determine when we have apparent reason so to think. And therefore I conclude it safest for our selves rather to err in treating one another in our differences better than we deserve, than worse. And so to do is better for them also that differ from us, so far as they differ from Truth; yea, and better for the Truth it self too. For it is often seen, that when a prejudice is taken up against the persons of men, be the Cause never so just, the Truth it self is the less esteemed, if not shrewdly suspected, because held by them; especially when its evidence is not written as with a Sun-beam. So that when we, by an undue behaviour in pleading the Cause
of

of Truth, draw upon our selves disrespect from them whom we would draw from Errour, we prevaricate in the matter, and act cross to our own design: A thing which some engaged in Controversies have been to blame in.

However, it will be our wisdom in reading of Books of this nature to mind the Argument, and to take little notice of any unbecoming girds or reflections, unless it be to bewail them, and to endeavour to follow, as indeed there is need, that saying of our Saviour, *let him that readeth understand, Mark 13. 14.* Thus desiring, that you and I, and all other Christians, may speak the truth in love, in love both to it and men, and receive it in the love of it, that we may be benefitted by it, I take my leave, and remain as ever,

Your most affectionately to serve

April 22.
1675.

you in all offices of Christian

love and respect, &c.

FINIS.

*Books printed for, and sold by Walter
Kettilby at the Bishop's-head in
St. Paul's Church-yard.*

H. *Mori Opera Theologica*, Folio.
• Price 1 l. 10 s.

Dr. *More's* Reply to a late Answer to
his Antidote against Idolatry, with the
Appendix, Octavo. Price 4 s.

Spencer dissertatio de Urim & Thum-
mim, Octavo. Price 3 s. 6 d.

Frederici Lossi Observationes Medici,
Octavo. Price 2 s. 6 d.

Epigrammata Juvenilia in quatuor par-
tes divisa, Entomia, Seria, Satyras & Jocosas,
per Guilielmum Speed. Price bound 9 d.

Dr. *Smyth's* unjust man's doom: as exa-
mined by the several kinds of Justice, and
their obligation, with a particular repre-
sentation of Injustice, and danger of par-
tial Conformity, Octavo. Price 1 s.

Dr. *Smyth's* two Sermons at the Assizes
in *Suffolk*, Octavo. Price 1 s.

Mr. *Hallywell's* Discourse of the Excel-
lency of Christianity, Octavo. Price 6 d.

--- Account of Familism, as it is revived,
and propagated by the Quakers, Octavo.
Price 1 s. Some

Some Opinions of Mr. *Hobbes* considered in a second Dialogue between *Philautus* and *Timothy*, Octavo. Price 2 s. 6 d.

Breerwood's Enquiries into the Diversities of Languages, Octav. Price 2 s. 6 d.

A Stop to the Course of Separation, or the Separation of the new Separatists condemned, &c. Octavo. Price 1 s.

Libertas Ecclesiastica, by *Will. Falkner*, Octavo. Price 5 s.

The Mystery of Iniquity unfolded, or the false Apostles and the Authors of Popery compared, in their Secular Design, and means of accomplishing it, by corrupting the Christian Religion, under pretence of promoting it, Octavo. Price 1 s.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Discourse of the Knowledge of Jesus Christ, and our Union and Communion with him, &c. Octavo. Price 2 s. 6 d.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Defence and Continuation of the Discourse concerning the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and our Union and Communion with him, with a particular respect to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and the Charge of Socinianism and Pelagianism, Oct. Price 5 s.

Dr. *Webster's* History of Metals, wherein

in is declared the signs of Ores and Minerals both before and after digging, &c. Quarto. Price 5 s.

The great Duty of Self-Resignation to the Divine Will: By the late Pious and Learned *John Worthington*, D.D. Octavo. Price 2 s.

A Discourse concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us, and our Sins to him, with many useful questions thereunto pertaining, Resolved. Together with Reflections more at large upon what hath been published concerning that Subject, by Mr. *Robert Ferguson* in his Interest of Reason in Religion; and by Dr. *John Owen* in his Book stiled *Communion with God*. By *Tho. Hotchkis*, Oct. Price 2 s.

An Account of Mr. *Ferguson's* Common-place-book, in 2 Letters, Quart. Price 6 d.

The Comparative Anatomy of Trunks, together with an account of their Vegetation grounded thereupon; In 2 Parts: The former read before the *R. Society*, Feb. 25. 1674 $\frac{4}{5}$. the latter, June 17. 1675. the whole explicated by several Figures in 19 Copper-plates; presented to the *R. S.* in the years 1673. and 1674. by *Nehemiah Grew*, M. D. and Fellow of the *R. S.* in Octavo. Price 4 s. 6 d.